


REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated July 13, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,512,985 ("Whitefield"). Additionally, claims 13-16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner stated the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 10-12 have been amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims.

Amended independent claims 1, 10, 11, and 12 are all directed to a system for monitoring the manufacture of a plurality of objects **automatically, without human intervention**. Generally, claims 1, 10, 11, and 12 disclose a system that performs an analysis of a manufacturing process using at least one process parameter value. The result of the analysis is used to mark any of the plurality of physical objects that do not satisfy prescribed criteria. Any physical object marked as not meeting the prescribed criteria is sent for special treatments and removed from the manufacturing process. The portions of Whitefiled cited by the Examiner disclose a method performed by a **human operator**. In contrast, independent claims 1, 10, 11, and 12 recite monitoring the manufacturer of a plurality of objects **automatically, without human intervention**.

Therefore, Reconsideration of claims 1-16 is respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200